

On page 3, strike lines 8 through and including 16.

**FEINSTEIN (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 3092**

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SIMON, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, and Mr. BRYAN) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 1833, *supra*, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the United States has the most advanced medical training programs in the world;

(2) medical decisions should be made by trained medical personnel in consultation with their patients based on the best medical science available;

(3) it is the role of professional medical societies to develop medical practice guidelines and it is the role of medical education centers to provide instruction on medical procedures;

(4) the Federal Government should not supersede the medical judgment of trained medical professionals or limit the judgment of medical professionals in determining medically appropriate procedures;

(5) the Federal criminal code is an inappropriate and dangerous means by which to regulate specific and highly technical medical procedures; and

(6) the laws of 41 States currently restrict post-viability abortions.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should not criminalize a specific medical procedure.

SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in Federal law shall be construed to prohibit the States, local governments, local health departments, medical societies, or hospital ethical boards from regulating, restricting, or prohibiting post-viability abortions to the extent permitted by the Constitution of the United States.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will hold an open markup on December 12, 1995, at 9:30 a.m. in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building. The markup agenda will include S. 814, to provide for the reorganization of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and S. 1159, to establish an American Indian Policy Information Center.

Those wishing additional information should contact the Committee on Indian Affairs at 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee to meet on Thursday, December 7, at 9:30 a.m. for a hearing on S. 94, prohibition on the consideration of retroactive tax increases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary be authorized to hold a business meeting during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 7, 1995, at 10 a.m. in SD226.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 7, 1995, to hold a hearing to receive testimony on "An Agenda for the Information Age: Managing Senate Technology."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

**THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE
BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995**

• Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I would like to join my colleagues in expressing my disappointment in President Clinton's veto of the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. The Republican plan would have resulted in a balanced Federal budget in 2002, a plan that would have finally restrained the growth of Federal spending to a manageable level. And yet, President Clinton felt compelled to veto our plan. He felt compelled to protect his priorities.

President Clinton's statements regarding protecting his priorities belie one sad truth buried in his rhetoric: The only thing that is not a priority to this President is balancing the budget. There is only lip service one day, a speech another, a third budget plan this week. If we are to believe that President Clinton is serious about his commitment to balancing the budget, why is he now submitting a third budget? Why did he first submit two budgets that resulted in deficits of over \$200 billion in the year 2000 and beyond?

The only logical conclusion to be drawn from the President's actions is that he is trying to deal in the most politically popular way he can with a Congress that is unwavering in one commitment, a commitment to the American people to, once and for all, put the U.S. Government on the road to fiscal health.

The future could be so bright if the President would only join us in agreeing to a balanced budget. We will compromise, but not on the principle that the budget must be balanced using credible, honest projections. There is a growing consensus among respected economists that interest rates will drop significantly, 1, maybe 2 percent, if a balanced budget is reached. This would mean cheaper home mortgages, less to pay for student loans, lower credit card payments. American families will save again. Without a balanced budget agreement, though, there will be profoundly negative consequences. Chairman Greenspan of the

Federal Reserve predicts a "quite negative" reaction in the financial markets if no deal is reached, and a sharp increase in long-term interest rates.

And yet we are mired here in a disagreement that is disheartening to all of us, especially those of us who were elected just last year, those of us who heard from thousands of citizens across our respective States, those of us who heard, "balanced the budget" above all else.

The disagreement between Congress and the President comes down to one issue: the difference between credibility and something for nothing. Syndicated columnist Ben Wattenberg makes a compelling case in yesterday's edition of USA Today that the country's social ills boil down to one fundamental shift in the Nation's attitude: The attitude that it is possible to gain something for nothing. Whether it is crime, poor education, or even the epidemic problem of illegitimacy, Mr. Wattenberg traces the cause of these ills to the lack of personal responsibility and the lack of effort, hard work, and even sacrifice that is necessary to gain anything worth having. Unfortunately, the White House's phony numbers are the means to appear to balance the budget, without making any adjustments or imposing any discipline on Government spending.

The Republican plan, on the other hand, recognizes the need for adjustment, reform, and downsizing of the Federal Government. It reforms Government programs in a sensible way and provides tax relief for hardworking American families and to spur investment. It will result in long-term benefits—a stable and growing economy, lower interest rates, greater investment, higher incomes, millions of new jobs. The benefits of the Republican plan are not unlike the gratification of earning one's own way in the world, completing an education, or staying married for 40 years. Hard work, but definitely worth it.

So, I close with these thoughts, Mr. President. The American people will rise to any occasion, and if we ask them to help us address this fiscal crisis, they will. What they won't do is allow this generation to burden the next with an impossible debt. I am disappointed that the President chose not to sign the historic Balanced Budget Act of 1995, but I remain hopeful that the administration will trust the American people and agree to a balanced budget. We must.●

**TRIBUTE TO DR. THOMAS E.
BELLAVANCE**

• Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Thomas E. Bellavance as he retires as the president of Salisbury State University.

In 1980, when the Board of Trustees of State Universities and Colleges unanimously selected Dr. Bellavance to be the new president of Salisbury State College, Thom arrived on campus with